



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/758,199	01/16/2004	Gagan Puranik	SKY03009	4894
25537	7590	10/01/2007		
VERIZON PATENT MANAGEMENT GROUP 1515 N. COURTHOUSE ROAD SUITE 500 ARLINGTON, VA 22201-2909			EXAMINER NGUYEN, MINH DIEU T	
			ART UNIT 2137	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 10/01/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@verizon.com

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/758,199

Applicant(s)

PURANIK ET AL.

Examiner

Minh Dieu Nguyen

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 August 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 20-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 20-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 January 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This office action is in response to the communication dated 8/21/2007.
2. Claims 1-8 and 20-27 are pending. Claims 9-19 and 28-33 are being withdrawn as being directed to a non-elected invention.

### ***Drawings***

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: according to the specification, paragraph 63 on page 14, "Fig. 6B, element 635" should be --Fig. 6B, element 675--; "Fig. 6B, element 690" should be --Fig. 6B, element 680--. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Specification***

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

On page 7, paragraph 33, the phrase "routing server 230" should be --routing server 220--.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Objections***

5. Claims 1-2, 6-8, 20-21 and 25-27 are objected to because of the following informalities:

a) As to claims 1 and 20, the phrase "determining the destination address" should be --determining destination address--; "routing the message" should be --routing the received message--.

b) As to claims 2 and 21, the phrase "the communications protocol employed to transmit the received message is the ReFLEX protocol" should be --communications protocol employed to transmit the received message is ReFLEX protocol--.

c) As to claims 6 and 25, the phrase "determining whether the encrypted message" should be --determining whether an encrypted message--.

d) As to claims 7 and 26, the phrase "to a hosted crypto server" should be --to the hosted crypto server--.

e) As to claims 8 and 27, the phrase "to an enterprise crypto server" should be --to the enterprise crypto server--.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1, 3-8, 20 and 22-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Moles et al. (7,024,557).

a) As to claims 1 and 20, Moles discloses a method for secure message reception from a plurality of remote devices (Moles: Abstract) comprising: receiving a message; obtaining a reverse channel address associated with the received message (Moles: col. 7, lines 48-66); ensuring that the received message is associated with at least one of the remote devices (Moles: col. 8, lines 7-11); determining destination address for the received message by obtaining a reverse channel address associated with the received message (Moles: col. 9, lines 37-43) and routing the received message to the destination address (Moles: col. 9, lines 61-66).

b) As to claims 3 and 22, Moles discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the step of ensuring further comprises reviewing header information in the received message (Moles: col. 9, lines 39-43).

c) As to claims 4 and 23, Moles discloses the method of claim 3, wherein the determining step further comprises retrieving a remote device profile based upon the obtained reverse channel address (Moles: col. 2, lines 36-45).

d) As to claims 5 and 24, Moles discloses the method of claim 4, wherein the determining step further comprises obtaining the destination address from a remote device (Moles: col. 9, lines 39-42).

e) As to claims 6-8 and 25-27, Moles discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the determining step further comprises determining whether an encrypted message is associated with a remote device that is associated with a hosted crypto server or an enterprise crypto server (Moles: col. 9, lines 49-52), wherein the encrypted message is routed to a hosted crypto server and to an enterprise crypto server (i.e. provisioning server, Moles: col. 9, lines 64-65).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 2 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moles et al. (7,024,557) in view of Bims et al. (6,259,911).

Moles discloses the method of claim 1, however he is silent on the communications protocol employed to transmit the received message is ReFLEX protocol.

Bims is relied on for the teaching of having the communications protocol employed to transmit the received message is ReFLEX protocol (Bims: col. 1, lines 13-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the use of having the communications protocol employed to transmit the received message is ReFLEX protocol in the system of Moles, as Bims teaches so as to provide a foundation for enabling communications.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Minh Dieu Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3873.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on 571-272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Art Unit: 2137

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



mdn  
9/20/07